

#### REMARKS

The Examiner's action dated May 6, 2004, has been received, and its contents carefully noted.

Submitted herewith is an accurate translation of Applicant's French priority application 00 13400, filed October 19, 2004.

The Examiner will note that the Specification and claims appearing in the translation of the priority application are virtually identical to those of the present U.S. application and, in particular, claims 7 and 11 of the priority application define the same subject matter as claims 7 and 11 of the present application. Accordingly, it is requested that the Applicant be accorded priority rights based on the French priority application filed on October 19, 2004.

The rejection of claims 7 and 11 as unpatentable over Keppers in view of Kelley (it is assumed that this is the secondary reference relied upon to support the prior art rejection) is traversed for the reason that Kelley is based on an application filed in the U.S. after Applicant's priority date. Therefore, in view of the previous submission of a certified copy of the priority application and the present submission of an accurate translation thereof Kelley is not

available as prior art against the claims of the present application. For the above reason, it is requested that the prior art rejection of claims 7 and 11 be withdrawn. Since all of the claims presently being examined are now in allowable condition, it is asked that the Petition filed on March 5, 2004, now be considered.

Furthermore, claims 8, 9 and 11 have been amended only in a formal respect to provide a more appropriate scope of protection for the present invention. Obviously, these claims distinguish patentably over the prior art even without use of the terminology "consisting in".

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

By

  
Jay M. Finkelstein  
Registration No. 21,082

JMF:dtb

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197

Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\BN\L\lav1\Congard2\PTO\03AUG04-amendment.doc